DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE DEFENSE INFORMATION SYSTEMS AGENCY UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Integration Decision Paper (IDP):

Migration System Selection for XYZ Functional Activity (TEMPLATE)

CENTER FOR INTEGRATION AND INTEROPERABILITY

22 February 1994

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This Integration Decision Paper (IDP) summarizes the migration system decision to be implemented by the Functional Activity. This IDP documents the migration system selected and the projected costs
o implement the selected system throughout the functional activity. This section also identifies the return on
nvestment and payback period associated with implementing this decision. This document fulfills the requirement
stated in DoD 8020.1-M to select a migration system for the affected functional activity.
it should be noted the information gathered for the Integration Decision Paper (IDP) can be reused as the
nformation technology (IT) component of the Functional Economic Analysis (FEA) and functional process
mprovement (FPI) efforts required by DoD 8020.1-M. This information can also be used to support future cross-
Functional integration efforts as part of ongoing DoD Enterprise Integration efforts.
Migration System Selection. The management of the functional activity has selected
as its migration system. The implementation process associated with the proposed migration system is scheduled to be completed by the end of FY
ystem is seneduled to be completed by the end of 1 1
Implementation Plan. Figure ES - 1 provides an overview of the proposed migration implementation plan:
Figure ES - 1, Action Plan GANTT Chart
<graphic: es1.pcx=""></graphic:>
Graphic files were not included on original disk.)
Γhe migration to will be completed by
All functional data used by the system will be standardized by
will not be brought into full compliance with the DoD standard technical
architecture by fiscal year (FY) This will not occur until the

make expanded use of me	get system is completed after FY By FY, the migration system will ga-centers, base level infrastructure, and other components of the Defense Information implementation of the DII will occur after FY with the implementation of
	are ES - 2 provides an overview of baseline costs, investment requirements, and iated with implementing the proposed migration solution.
<graphic: es2.pcx=""></graphic:>	
This figure illustrates the annual operating costs with the proposed migration sy over the proposed seven y	anticipated savings from the implementation of the proposed migration system. The ll be reduced from a total of \$ to \$ by FY Implementing stem,, will result in a total of \$ in operations savings sears of the system's life. This translates into a savings-to-investment ratio of to fithe life cycle and to over the full seven years of the system's life. has a
Financial Impacts.	The financial impact of implementing the proposed solution is:
	The proposed Action Plan (i.e., implementation plan) may be implemented within current resources. Implementing the proposed Action Plan will require additional resources.

SECTION ONE: MIGRATION GOALS

This Integration Decision Paper (IDP) documents the results of a migration system selection process undertaken for the XYZ functional activity within the ABC functional area. This section of the IDP summarizes the status of related planning activities for both the functional area and functional activity, the status of the performance measures and targets used in the management of ongoing operations, and both near and long term goals for the XYZ functional activity.

1
·.
s.
S
OII.

- **1.4 Long-Term Goals (4-7 years).** The following long-term goals have guided the selection of the migration system for this functional activity:
 - The functional activity uses only databases shared with other functional activities within the functional area.
 - All functional activity information infrastructure is fully compliant with the Technical Architecture Framework for Information Management (TAFIM).
 - percent of the functional activity's information resources are provided by the DII.
 - percent of functional activity processes are cross-functionally integrated across the Defense Enterprise.
 - percent of functional activity processes are functionally integrated with global organizations.

SECTION TWO: BASELINE ENVIRONMENT

2.1 Baseline Environment. Automated infor			
Each of the lega	acy applications support the base	ic data entry, activity prod	cessing,
reporting and external system interface requi	rements of each service and age	ency within the functional	activity.
Two of these baseline applications (and) are base- (or lo	ocal-) level
systems. Three of these baseline application	s (,	, and) are
consideration as the migration system.2.2 Baseline Workload Data. Schedule 1 su applications within this functional activity.	ummarizes the salient cost and w	orkload data for each of	the legacy
Schedule 1 - Baseline Workload Data			
<graphic: schd1.pcx=""></graphic:>			

2.3 Legacy Applications. Schedule 2 summarizes the basic characteristics of each legacy application.

Schedule 2 - Legacy Applications

<GRAPHIC: SCHD2.PCX

2.4 Baseline Technical Infrastructure. Schedule 3 characterizes the infrastructure used by each legacy application in this functional activity.

Schedule 3 - Baseline Technical Infrastructure

<GRAPHIC: SCHD3.PCX

SECTION THREE: TECHNICAL ASSESSMENT OF MIGRATION ALTERNATIVES

3.1 Technical Comparison of Legacy Applications. Schedule 4 includes migration assessment scores generated by the Defense Integration Support Tools (DIST) for each legacy application. Generally, these scores represent the relative ability of each legacy application to meet this functional activity's migration requirements.

Schedule 4 - Technical Comparison of Legacy Applications

<GRAPHIC: SCHD4.PCX

3.2 Alternatives Identification. Using the technical comparison scores listed above, managers from this functional activity chose and as potential migration systems.
3.3 Functional and Operational Description of Each Alternative.
is a batch driven, mainframe based system which meets a sufficient number of the functional activity's core requirements is a distributed system which addresses most of the functional activity's core requirements.
SECTION FOUR: ECONOMIC ANALYSIS OF MIGRATION ALTERNATIVES
This section compares the costs of the baseline system with the costs of the proposed migration alternatives.
4.1 Baseline IT Costs. Schedule 5 summarizes the annual information technology (IT) expenditures for each legacy application. They reflect only the IT component of each element of the current Functional Economic Analysis Model (FEAM) Cost Breakdown Structure (i.e., Civilian Labor, Military Labor, Equipment, Facilities, Materiel, General and Administrative (G&A), and Other).
Schedule 5 - Baseline IT Costs (Constant FY94 K\$)
<graphic: schd5.pcx=""></graphic:>

4.2 Cost Comparison of Alternatives. Schedule 6 compares the annual investment and operations costs of each migration system alternative with the annual operations costs of the baseline environment.

Schedule 6 - Comparison of Annual IT Costs

<GRAPHIC: SCHD6.PCX>

4.3 Annual Cost Reductions. Schedule 7 shows the cost reductions achieved for each alternative by fiscal year. This table presents both the payback period for the investment in each system as well as both a four year and seven year return on investment (ROI) calculation. This calculation shows the savings to investment ratio for each alternative for each period.

Schedule 7 - Annual Cost Reductions and Economic Analysis Factors

<GRAPHIC: SCHD6.PCX>

SECTION FIVE: PROPOSED MIGRATION SOLUTION

This section summarizes the selected migration system and describes the selected system's proposed configuration.

5.1 Migration System Selection. The functional management of the functional activity has selected
as the migration system. The proposed migration is scheduled to be completed by the en
of FY Schedule 8 summarizes data concerning the selection and implementation of the migration system
was selected as the migration system because it supports all the major functional
requirements identified for the functional activity, its relatively high score in the technical
evaluation, and its savings-to-investment ratio.
Schedule 8 - Migration Decision Considerations
Schedule o Migration Scholaerations
<graphic: schd8.pcx=""></graphic:>
The economic rationale for the selection of as the migration system is as follows.
Baseline operations and maintenance (O&M) requirements for this functional activity (excluding investment
requirements) are approximately \$ annually (constant FY dollars). This figure includes all
software maintenance and communications charges for all systems currently supporting operations within the
functional activity. The proposed migration would require a total investment of over the proposed four year
implementation schedule, including of investment in the first year. However, substantial cost reductions would be
generated by the proposed migration- a total of approximately \$ during the period FY through .
This information is presented graphically in figure ES - 2. Failure to deploy the proposed migration system will
result in higher levels of annual O&M expenditure and will result in ongoing opportunity losses from continuing
baseline operations equal to approximately \$ per month.
5.2 Migration Workload Data. Schedule 9 includes workload information for the proposed solution,
·

Schedule 9 - Migration Workload Data GRAPHIC: SCHD9.PCX> 5.3 Migration Applications. Schedule 1 0 includes applications information for the proposed solution, Schedule 10 - Migration Applications GRAPHIC: SHD10.PCX> 5.4 Migration Technical Infrastructure. Schedule 11 summarizes general infrastructure characteristics for the proposed solution, Schedule 11 - Migration Technical Infrastructure GRAPHIC: SHD11.PCX> 5.5 Migration OSE Compliance. As shown in schedule 12, _______would meet selected Open Systems Environment (OSE) requirements approved in the Technical Reference Model (TRM) of DoD's TAFIM (November 1993). Schedule 12 - Migration OSE Compliance GRAPHIC: SHD12.PCX>

5.6 Projected Costs for Selected Migration Solution.	Schedule	13	provides	estimated	annual	costs	for the
proposed migration solution,							

Schedule 13 - Projected Costs for Selected Migration Solution

<graphic:< th=""><th>SHD13.PCX></th></graphic:<>	SHD13.PCX>
---	------------

SECTION SIX: MIGRATION PLAN

This section summarizes the timing and schedule needed to initiate the migration path.

6.1 Migration Path and Timing. Schedule 14 includes the migration path and timing for the proposed migration solution,______.

Schedule 14 - Migration Path and Timing

<GRAPHIC: SHD14.PCX>2

Proposed Migration Implementation Schedule. Schedule 15 shows the implementation schedule needed to initiate the migration solution.

Schedule 15 - Action Plan

<GRAPHIC: SHD15.PCX>

SECTION SEVEN: RISK ASSESSMENT

This section discusses project risk as it affects the deployment of the proposed migration system.

7.1 Risk Assessment. The Functional Area Program Manager (FAPM) for functional
activityand the Joint Functional/Technical Team have reviewed the risks associated with the proposed
migration selection. The status of the risk assessment is as follows:
A formal risk assessment has not been developed for this functional activity. The target date for completing this risk assessment is
The risk assessment associated with this proposed migration was completed and published on
7.2 Major Risk Area Identification. Based on the completed risk analysis, the FAPM determined that the following risk areas must be addressed. The first major risk area is that technology may not be available to allow the functional activity to extend full baseline functionality to the selected migration system, The second major risk area is that sufficient resources may not be available to allow
timely implementation of the proposed migration.
7.3 Recommendation to Reduce the Risk Level of Major Risk Areas. The
7.4 Contingency Plans. The management the functional activity should consider the cost-effectiveness of other alternatives if, after the migration implementation process is initiated, the unavailability of required technology acts as a restriction on timely implementation of the migration system. Further, the PSA should consider the effectiveness of reallocating budget from other functional activity accounts to this migration effort if resources are inadequate.
SECTION EIGHT: IMPACTS, ISSUES, AND CONCERNS
8.1 Organizational Impacts. Thefunctional activity's migration path toward Corporate Information Management (CIM) objectives will keep the organization viable, since these objectives must be met by all agencies within DoD.

8.2 Personnel Impacts. Although numerous managers and operating personnel may be dislocated by the increased productivity made possible by the implementation of the migration system, the management of the functional activity does not anticipate any changes in overall personnel levels to result from the
implementation of the proposed migration system.
8.3 Operational Issues and Resolutions. The following operational issues and resolutions have been identified.
8.3.1 Issue Identification. Migration implementation may impede the functional activity's operations if the transition from the baseline to does not proceed smoothly. For example, if planners have underestimated the time needed to migrate all baseline operations to, the functional activity may experience budget pressure to consolidate and discontinue baseline operations before the migration system is capable of addressing all the stated functional requirements.
8.3.2 Issue Resolution. The functional activity could use a combination of interim testing and close watching methods to resolve the transition issue identified above. For example, the Integration Manager (IM) for this functional area could recommend to management that they perform an interim migration test to verify the smoothness of the transition. Specifically, the IM could suggest management migrate a selected set of baseline functions before it migrates all the functions supported by the migration system. If the selected set of baseline functions transition smoothly, management could sequentially migrate additional sets of functions until full baseline functionality is achieved. The IM should request the responsible PSA to seek assistance from the DoD Information Policy Council or the Corporate Functional Integration Board (CFIB) in the event interim testing has the potential to effect DoD migration plans.
8.4 Other Issues and Concerns. functional management has not identified any additional issues to be addressed as part of this IDP.